

**ISLAND COUNTY COMMISSIONERS – MINUTES OF MEETING**

**SPECIAL SESSION – JULY 20, 1999**

The Board of Island County Commissioners met in Special Session beginning at 9:30 a.m. on July 20, 1999, in the Island County Courthouse, Annex Basement Hearing Room, Coupeville, Washington, for the purpose of conducting a Joint Board of County Commissioners and Island County Planning Commission Growth Management Act [GMA] Workshop on Mineral Lands of Long Term Commercial Significance. [*Special Session Notice GMA doc. #4447*]

**Attendance:**

*County Commissioners:* Mike Shelton; Wm. L. McDowell; Bill Thorn

*Planning Commission:* Anne Pringle; Tom Olsen; Sheilah Crider; George Crampton, Mike Joselyn [Dave Osterberg excused]

*Consultant:* Keith Dearborn, Dearborn & Moss, PLLC

*Staff:* Vince Moore, Planning Director; Phil Bakke, Comprehensive Plan Manager; Lew Legat, County Engineer; Dave Bonvouloir, Solid Waste Manager

*Audience:* Darlyne Krieg; Laurence Moses [*attendance sheet on file GMA doc. #4452*]

**GMA COMPLIANCE CALENDAR REVIEWED**

Mr. Dearborn brought to the workshop the proposed revised GMA Compliance calendar [*GMA Doc. 4448*] that was reviewed yesterday with the Board, extended until today in order to review the revisions with the Planning Commission. Proposed calendar changes of substance begin in August:

Aug. 9 10:45 a.m. Hearing - Correction to Cover Page – Ordinance #C-76-99 Ru AG

Aug. 10 [No GMA Planning Commission]

Aug. 16 1:30 p.m. Public Hearing – Amendments to Comp Plan and Ch. 17.03 Mineral Lands of Long Term Comm. Significance

Aug. 23 3:30 p.m. add hearings: Langley Zoning Code and Commercial AG/Ru FOR

Aug. 24 [No GMA Planning Commission]

Aug. 27 1:30 Joint BOCC/PC Workshop on AG Lands of Long Term Commercial Significance

Sept. 13 1:30 p.m. Joint Public Hearing with Planning Commission on AG [ & the Board to continue its hearing to Sept. 27]

Sept. 14 9:00 a.m. Planning Commission – Public meeting – Deliberation and Recommendation on Ag Lands

Sept. 24 9:30 a.m. Joint BOCC/PC Workshop on Rural Densities

Sept. 27 3:00 p.m. Add BOCC continued public hearing from Sept 13 on AG

Oct. 11 1:30 p.m. Joint BOCC/PC hearing – Rural Densities

Oct. 12 9:00 a.m. Planning Commission Meeting for deliberation and recommendation on Rural Densities

Oct. 18 7:00 p.m. Public Hearing on Camano Island on Rural Densities

Oct 25 9-11 a.m. Public Hearing – final action

Mineral lands, depending on today's discussion, staff feels there is no need for the Planning Commission to do any further work on that issue. The first time the Planning Commission would be back would be August 27<sup>th</sup> for a joint workshop on AG lands. The County is proposing to create an AG Ad Hoc Advisory committee that Bill Thorn would Chair and Anne Pringle would represent the Planning Commission. The Committee would be tasked to make recommendations on how to comply with the Growth Board's order and present that to the Planning Commission and Board at the joint workshop August 27<sup>th</sup>. Under County Code and State Law the Planning Commission is the principle body in the Comprehensive Plan process. The Board by its ordinance in 1962 required that all planning issues be heard in public hearing by the Planning Commission.

After further review and discussion, the Board agreed to add to the calendar a Public Hearing on AG to be held on September 20 at 7:00 p.m. on Camano Island. The Board will approve the revised calendar with these changes at staff session July 23<sup>rd</sup> or at regular meeting July 26<sup>th</sup>.

### MINERAL LANDS OF LONG TERM COMMERCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

**Display:** Map E, Island County Mineral Resource Extraction Sites [*GMA Doc. #4449*]

**Handout:** Mineral Lands Issue Paper prepared by Phil Bakke, including proposed Ordinance, today's date (history, proposal 8 pages; proposed ordinance and exhibits - 7 pages) [*GMA doc. #4451*].

Mr. Dearborn presented to issue at hand. Mineral lands were mapped, now Map E in the adopted Comprehensive Plan. As a result of action last month, the Board made minor changes to surface mining regulations to address a number of issues the Coalition raised in the Growth Board appeal and those issues dismissed. The Growth Board's final decision on the Comp Plan and Development Regulations noted that the County had not finished mineral lands work and wanted to wait for DNR maps to be prepared before finishing that work. The Growth Board suggested the County had to have lower densities than 5 acre lots in the rural area. One of the foundation issues for the Growth Board decision are rural densities, and that needs to be resolved so it is no longer an argument as to why the County should have further down zoning in the County. There may need to be further down zoning in the County but Mr. Dearborn did not believe it needed to be done in order to protect mineral lands, instead, felt there were other ways to accomplish protection of mineral lands. One of the questions to decide on is whether, because of the scope of the proposal, the Planning Commission should hold its own hearing on this subject or whether this is just fine-tuning decisions already made. If it is the decision this is fine-tuning decisions already made the Board could take action without a recommendation from the Planning Commission; if not, it would be the responsibility of the Planning Commission to first make a recommendation to the Board before the Board takes action.

Mr. Bakke went back through the Comp Plan and re-looked at the mineral lands issue. It was unclear that Map E was intended to be designations, and the County did not follow through on some of the protection measures. As part of the 1998 GMA Comp Plan and Development Regulations, the County intended to designate mineral resource sites shown on Map E as lands of long term commercial significant. No changes were made to surface mine standards which were re-adopted in Ch. 17.03; however, surface mines made a conditional use in the Commercial AG zone. On June 21<sup>st</sup> some additional modifications to the standards were adopted, the most significant was removing the ability of people who own Commercial AG property from pursuing a surface mining application.

The County currently requires community meetings for all conditional use permits for lands that have not been predetermined to be lands of long term commercial significance. Siting and phasing standards were added setting minimum site area of operations at 10 acre and site area for processing at 20 acres; on operations larger than 20 acres must develop in phases. Setbacks from property lines were increased from 50' to 200' and a minimum setback to

existing residential structures was set at 400', and standards for screening operations were strengthened. A provision of the 1984 adoption of the surface mining ordinance required that all pre-existing mines obtain a Certificate of Zoning Compliance (CZC) for review and those operations depicted on the map and approved with some general conditions. That has happened [see listing pages 3 and 4 of 8; note some sites owned by other people right now but at time when applications reviewed these were the names of owners of the sites]. There is a total of approximately 1276 acres identified on the chart. Lands not identified on the chart that the County knows of, will be included on Map E, such as: Island Sand and Gravel just outside Freeland.

Since 1984, the County has received applications for new operations; some operations were expanded during the period. Important to note that in conjunction with issuance of CZC decisions, the level of complaints received by the County from citizens with respect to on going operations of mines dropped to almost nothing. Some of the mines are currently being used in association for staging for importing certain kinds of materials from other mines that are located in the County and others that are located on the mainland. There has been interest in the past about conversion of the mining operation and implementation of reclamation for some of the older mines to include some type of yard waste processing which is something that can be permitted through County process [Site Plan Review] and would have to meet setback requirements, health codes, etc. Mr. Bakke has spoken with planners from four other jurisdictions: San Juan County; Snohomish County; Kitsap County; and Skagit County [refer to summary included in the Issue Paper pages 5-7].

### **Recommended Action:**

- Clarify the Comprehensive Plan so that mineral resource lands shown on Map E are clearly designated mineral lands of commercial significance.
- Show all parcels with mineral lands of long term commercial significance in the Island County Zoning Atlas and amend Section 17.03.050.C, Zoning Classifications and Overlays.
- Add mineral lands of long term commercial significance to Chapter 16.25 Agriculture and Forest Protection.
- Should new information be available from DNR as called for by RCW 36.70.A.B.1 the County will review its mineral resource designation September 1, 2002.

With the exception of the modifications to the Zoning Atlas to show mining operations as an overlay, all other recommendations were provided in proposed Ordinance PLG-022-99. DNR indicated funding received previously from the Legislature was allocated to map lands in the SW quarter of the State and DNR currently waiting for further funding. If additional funding is forthcoming from the Legislature DNR plans do the same analysis for the NW quarter of the State.

Mr. Dearborn added that DNR had agreed to develop a map comprehensive for the State as far as where mineral resources were, and to develop a programmatic EIS so no county would have to do it own independent environmental review of that map designation process. DNR did not get the total funding requested and apparently only had enough to do a portion of the State. The second thing required was a model regulatory ordinance and the WSAC committed to take the lead on preparing that ordinance [for sand, gravel and rock]; at last report, he was not aware that had been done. There was a requirement in 1998 that all counties as part of the comprehensive annual review [by 2002] had to look at minerals and utilize the information from DNR and WSAC as part of that review. Absent getting comprehensive information to designate future site locations, the County will need to continue to rely on the industry. As a part of any conditional use permit application received [3 pending] the County will need to make a determination whether those lands qualify as mineral lands of long term commercial significance and if they do, that issue would get docketed for next annual review of the Comp Plan. In addition any property owner who believes they have lands that qualify can make that request. Missing from the recommended action bullets if the availability of operators to add to the list. It is addressed on page 5 of the attachment to the proposed ordinance. Noted was that in about 90% of the

County surface mining is a conditional use, very unusual compared to other counties where very small areas of the county are potentially impossible to do surfacing mining. In the Commercial AG zone, farmers can have their own borrow pits but cannot propose a CUP for a large scale surface mine, rather meet their own needs through their own property borrow pit type use. Also suggested for Island County is to leave the option available for property owner to go through the annual plan amendment process or have the determination made through the CUP process directly and not have to go through two steps.

In discussion about whether or not there should be some more reasonable way for existing mine operations to expand onto adjoining properties that have common ownership, Mr. Dearborn explained that right now, the process would be a modified or expanded CUP. Island County has a sophisticated set of regulations, fine-tuned and modified since 1984, for surface mining. While very stringent in terms of environmental protection compared to other counties, the regulations provide flexibility in terms of process.

Discussion brought up by Commissioner McDowell related to Exhibit A, Page 6, item C, referring to the designation of all new mineral lands of long term significance must be comprised of contiguous parcels under one ownership measuring at least ten acres or larger, located in the RA, RF or R zone and meet criteria in WAC 365-190-070 mineral Resource Lands. He recalled previous discussion was that if it was contiguous to an existing permit and expanding, that it need not be ten acres -- look at existing lots under the same ownership. This item should be written so as not to be misconstrued that the adjacent parcel has to be 10 acres.

Mr. Dearborn agreed to write "C" to be clear it would apply to new proposals, not expansions of existing operations. Intent was to try to make it clear that the lands on Map E are the lands the County intends to designate, and in fact has done so. Mr. Bakke has looked at Map E and already identified some discrepancies and some existing operations that do not show on Map E. The recommendation is that if the process goes forward with a Board hearing rather than a Planning Commission hearing, the County would send a letter to all existing operators asking them to come in and verify that Map E does include all of the lands they own and believe should be designated of long term commercial significance. The Map will be converted to the Zoning Atlas and will be at an Assessor map scale.

Commissioner McDowell asked about Exhibit E [Excerpt from Findings of November 9, 1998] section #160 proposing to delete the sentence: "Because most of those sites have been in operation for some time, there is little Island County can do to affect either the conditions of their operations, or the development around them". His question was whether that was a true statement, and if not, what had changed.

Mr. Dearborn mentioned the concern was how to ensure protection from encroaching uses, not the regulation of the use. Only when someone comes in for a CUP could the County look at changing conditions of approval. Findings can be reworded to reflect this conversation, and made clear by stating that the CZC process was used to ensure that existing operations conformed to the County regulations. He did not, however, think it was true that the areas around existing sites are fully developed; it is in some cases, but not the rule. Exhibit E relates to both changing

the findings and creating new findings, and there is a need to expand the findings beyond what is listed to take into account:

1. Situation on Camano Island is completely different than Whidbey in terms of mineral resource lands of long term commercial significance. Most of Camano's needs now and in the future are going to be met from facilities and operations outside the County, not on Camano.

2. The way part of the need is met on Camano and Whidbey comes from the importation of

hard rock, stockpiling, and then utilizing it during the period of time when needed.

The other issue of concern is whether or not with the 1200+ acres of land enough identified to meet needs for 20 years.

Chairman Shelton observed that sand and gravel are site sensitive; for instance, the fact that there is a pit on North

Whidbey is going to make that pit probably the available site for materials for that particular project. There is no mineral lands of long term commercial significance on South Whidbey. There are some identified which he did not disagree, but on South Whidbey he did not believe anyone would be opening up a gravel pit and start crushing rock because the supply is not there. South Whidbey long term is dependent upon North Whidbey; the ferry is not practical at this point, even for county projects.

Lew Legat indicated that the Road Department did not consider hauling from Mukilteo because of not being able to rely on the service of the ferry [trying to lay asphalt and trucks caught in ferry line not workable].

Illustrating variables that may be available in the future, Mr. Bakke noted that this year's Planning Commission annual review docket included a proposal from a South Whidbey applicant to utilize an existing dock for barging crushed rock. The location chosen did not lend well to the operation proposed, but the Applicant is eager to find another location or make that location work. A lot of the operators did not feel they were in a position to estimate how much material left in the it because of experience with hitting pockets of different kinds of materials.

Mr. Dearborn thought GMA was unclear as far as an absolute requirement to project need; there are ways of making a projection of need and that can be worked on as far as best information and he thought that was needed. Differences it makes being designated mineral lands of long term commercial significance include: avoids community meeting requirement; and, the extent and scope of the notice required to adjacent property owners.

Under existing code, for the applicant with a surface mining operation, the next home that comes in adjacent to that gets a covenant placed upon the deed about not complaining as far as the surface mine operation next door. For farm and forestry a process was set up whereby the Assessor was to send notices to all property owners in the county and every deed that transferred within the Commercial AG, Rural Forest or Rural AG zone. He suggested that same provision could be expanded to mineral lands of long term commercial significance [surfacing mining operations that have not been classified as Mineral Lands of Long Term Commercial Significance would get the notice requirement for adjacent property owners, but not the broad county notice or deed requirement].

Ms. Crider suggested another distinction could be the time of the permit; if long term, should not have that 5 year review. If just a surface mining operation would not want to have a long infinite period of time but if designated it significant then it would meet the 20 year projection.

Mr. Dearborn noted that there was no recommendation being made as far as time line, because as Mr. Bakke stated, regulations are doing their job and the County has not been getting citizen complaints or enforcement actions, therefore there seems to be no reason to create a forced review in a shorter period of time. Could state as a matter of policy, that if it is designated, it cannot be limited to a short period of time.

Commissioner Shelton made the point that if someone wanted to have a pit only to extra raw sand and gravel that would be accommodated because the conditions on CUP would not be as extensive as someone wanting to move in a washer or crusher, etc. and he was interested in the County making that kind of process more inviting.

For new operations of that type, Mr. Dearborn suggested there could be a simple permitting process; instead of type III process make it administrative decision for just mining and it could be an expedited process [if processing it has to be 20 acres; extraction only 10 acres].

Commissioner Thorn commented that on Camano Island one operator has the idea to process organic wastes using the natural berming the pit provides as partial device to satisfy noise requirements, etc.; He asked with respect to the surface mining definition on page 9 if in any way the County was excluding that and was there a need for a supplementary definition so that a mining site or a former mining site can be permitted for that purpose.

Mr. Dearborn was aware that many counties were now looking at setting up regulatory systems to deal with yard waste and construction debris disposal. There is no provision for it right now in the Code; it is not surface mining, and understand it is being treated as part of reclamation with Health Department Review.

Dave Bonvouloir pointed out that the Health Department regulated yard waste operation facilities in Island County and

he thought probably a CUP would be required. He did think some provision should be made.

Low Legat expressed the importance to the o Public Works/Road operations in responding to storm events and resulting storm debris, there is a definite need to take the material, store it and then process it. As far as County pits, the Department uses some borrow, but essentially use those sites for collection of storm debris.

Mr. Bonvouloir explained that because Island County has no plan for dealing with a large scale disaster and the Department was now in drafting process of a new section in the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan that deals with designation of various county pits as areas where collection and staging of storm debris including demolition debris

General discussion was there needs to be some provision for this in Code that does not go against state law – make sure our regulations do not preclude that. There was general agreement not to pursue regulations or standards beyond health regulations to deal with that use, but Commissioner Thorn noted that it is a use that needs to be acknowledged in zoning.

Mrs. Crider thought the issue was addressed, referring to two paragraphs on page 5 of 8 in the front of the handout. In looking at that she suggested taking a specific approach as to what to do based on those two paragraphs. Mrs. Pringle's opinion was that every county should take care of its own construction demolition.

Commissioner McDowell stressed the importance for both the County as well of the private sector when some storm event occurs that causes major blow-downs, that there be some way to take care of those trees. In 2001 if that type material cannot be hauled off the property to burn it, somehow there needs to be some way some way to accommodate for that in times of emergencies.

Consensus: at this point was to make sure not to foreclose the ability to do that and that anything beyond that probably would need to be taken up with Dave Bonvouloir and the Solid Waste Management Committee, and potentially deal with it from a land use regulatory standpoint, if it appears there needs to be something done, but not as a part of the mineral resource element.

### **PUBLIC INPUT/COMMENTS**

Darlyne Krieg, Krieg Construction, submitted for the record, in writing, [GMA doc. #4450 and #4453] two parcels of land to consider as future resources. Krieg's have always been concerned about the impact and future growth around their pits. Looking at the map in terms of resources designated she noted the 40-acre pit [noted as Olympic Bank's on the list]. The resource there is not very great. In terms of the mentioned 1200 acres, she suggested really there is not 1200 acres of gravel, rather 1200 acres of questionable material. They are concerned about being able to protect lands they own that adjoin existing pits: one a 20 acre site adjoining an Island County pit on Taylor Road, tested and believe it is a future gravel source and would like to see it protected. Another is a 10 acre site that adjoins Krieg Concrete products designated on the map now as Everett Brothers Pits, that adjoins existing pits, purchased about two years ago. The site has not been tested but Krieg's believe there is a future source there. They have great concerns about not wanting to end up being impacted by future growth. The two sites have not had significant growth around them and she would like to see that protected. The site next to the concrete plant would be mined and processed, but for the other site mentioned she anticipated that source of material would be hauled to the existing operation. The expense of setting up gravel pits and crushers and permitting process is very prohibitive. They just went through a process on a 40 acre pit used to export material to the existing crushing site. There is a 10-acre piece between them and then the 40 acre site on Sleeper Road. They never anticipated that gravel pit would be depleted as quickly as it has been; the last 5 to 10 years has seen tremendous growth and hit a lot of sand pockets. The 40 acre pit bought two years' ago had gravel samples, etc., but they are finding out that they have to go in and mine lands that are a little more marginal. Mrs. Krieg did not see the need to protect the identify of the site and thought it advantageous to be listed. Concern is being able to protect the natural resource that is there. The cost to transport the material has to be considered. They work in Island County and do very little off-island; majority of material is used right here in Island County.

Ms. Crider suggested as a source of information going to operators to try to come up with a an estimated figure of what the needed material has been over the past 20 years; other potential sources for information would be well

drillers, and the City of Oak Harbor. Added to that information, Commissioner Thorn thought if it could be related to miles of road paved and numbers of building permits would provide some figures of merit.

Mrs. Krieg saw no problem in providing tonnage figures as far back as possible. She agreed that North Whidbey was essentially going to be the source of supply for Whidbey Island in the future. With the 20 acre and the 10 acre sites she asked to include, as far as how long that would satisfy need, she indicated it would depend on growth and the amount of sand encountered. At this point, the supply is something shorter than 20 years. She also agreed that the hard rock supply is basically going to have to come from off-island. It is easier to find sand than it is to find gravel. Looking at North Whidbey, from her experience, she could not guess as far as those lands that are not yet designated as far as how to protect them; she hated to see anyone's property down zoned, although agreed that encroaching 5 acre lots probably are a threat to the resource. She did not foresee any 60 to 80 acre sites on North Whidbey.

Larry Moses, representing Island Construction and Bill Massey, was in the process of just getting started in a much smaller operation, with an application currently pending, and concerned that not become unglued as a part of this process. Submitted as a part of the application, was some geologic studies done tending to confirm the site has long term commercial value and requested it be placed on Map E.

Mr. Bakke explained that the reason the site was not on Map E was because it was not an existing site. During hearings last year information had not been submitted for the record indicating it was commercial significance. Mr. Dearborn noted that staff would need to look at the information submitted to see if it meets designation in terms of WAC requirements to be used as a guide contained in WAC 365-190-070.

Mr. Moses expressed interest in comments about the County's attempt to contact current operators to determine what it is they have in the way of resources and thought the County should take a hard look at contacting current owners who are not operators, but who are not currently operating and have not sold it to someone who will operate it. He will suggest to Mr. Massey he look at other sites he presently owns that have potential and attempt to identify them to the County and be on Map E or be contacted by the County. One pending application he is aware of is located adjacent to their property and the two are cooperating in access roads and easement conditions, etc., but would not be doing precisely the same thing. He agreed with Mrs. Krieg that it is North Whidbey to focus on for protection of future mineral land resources, and agreed there was no question about the need to preserve resources. Resources are being used much faster than anyone thought, even though there are efforts to try to slow growth down, it nevertheless will happen and probably faster than anyone thinks.

Both Mrs. Krieg and Mr. Moses thought what needed to be protected was the ability to extract resources with a minimal amount of difficulty getting a permit, with the understanding there would be no washing, no processing, no sorting and sifting, just an extraction with re-vegetation again when played out – the material brought to existing sites for processing.

Commissioner Shelton observed that the County did not have the ability to move material by rail. The amount of material being moved by barge in the Puget Sound area is dwindling every year because as material sources play out, the ability to obtain new permits to set up barge facilities is almost impossible. If ever there was a community that needs to preserve mineral resources he thought it was Island County. He suggested that in the future, there might be a need to reserve the right to have a simple screening operation to sift out the sand.

Most agreed that 20 and 10 and smaller parcels on North Whidbey for this source of supply that there are no large ownerships, other than the Navy, that may be sitting on large gravel deposits. Mrs. Crider commented that out Sleeper Road there are significant deposits and some along the back side of the Navy's property but most of that had already been subdivided. Some are 5 acre parcels that do in fact abut may be a 10 acre piece or sandwiched between a couple of ten's. If the availability of rock is there, the County must not preclude it; if it is contiguous it makes no sense not to include it.

Mrs. Krieg noted they have a 5 acre parcel with permits; dealing with neighbor is a problem when you have that small a parcel, and the only reason they purchased it was because they had the option on the adjoining 10 and it borders

Concrete NorWest.

Commissioner McDowell suggested revising the 10 acre provision down to 5 acres if contiguous to an identified gravel pit. Commissioner Shelton agreed, and noted, however, he did not think someone would go out and get a stand-alone 5 acre parcel.

Consensus: 10 acre clearly applies to land not contiguous to an existing extraction or processing operation; 5 acres applies to 5 acres contiguous to an identified gravel pit.

### STAFF COMMENTS

Lew Legat explained that the Road Division of Public Works is an owner and operator, purchaser and regulator of pits, owning a number of sites around the Island, and island, including a crushing operation from the Henni Pit. Three-quarters of the material used for Road projects, however, is purchased from private contractors in the area. He saw the need eventually on Camano to buy material further away. Material used to be barged in to Freeland, and as the transportation system is impacted by traffic, it may be that barging is not such a bad idea in the future. On Camano where there are a few small pits means all that material is hauled in across State Highway 532 which has some capacity problems [not only for what the County uses but the private sector as well ]. There are a few meager sites on South Whidbey for materials which requires that it all be hauled from Coupeville or north of Oak Harbor down Highway 20. The Department has to react to storm events and disasters and needs to take debris off roadways in a prompt manner and take it somewhere close by; old pit sites are used and in the past have been able to burn which may not be an option in the future, which would require chipping or hauling material somewhere else. Storage of chipped material becomes a health issue [nitrate leaching]. It is costly for future operations to haul everything to Coupeville and put it in a transfer box, ship it to the mainland, then onto a railroad car to Oregon for disposal. Regardless of remaining supply on Island, roads have to be maintained and the Department therefore concerned about being able to have a resource in the long term, beyond 20 years, and having the flexibility to either make it, buy it through local contractors, or have it hauled in.

Commissioner McDowell asked that Mr. Legat provide use data for the last 10 years [and estimate regarding State roads]. Mr. Legat indicated he could do so, but did note the importance of not counting the same material twice [that Krieg by contact supplied to the County]. He thought it would be better to look at what the County produced itself – go back and look at projects and see how much material the County purchased for its own needs. County wide in a year they use about 4,000 tons of crushed top course; 36,000 tons crushed base course and about 8,000 tons chip rock and purchase another 20,000 tons of asphalt concrete pavement. Additionally, some borrow or fill is used on projects and need to take into consideration the State as well maintenance of roads.

Commissioner McDowell pointed out another big user of the products is the Navy to maintain roads and the runway.

Dave Bonvouloir reviewed concerns from the standpoint of solid waste:

1. Storm and disaster debris. Foresee in the Solid Waste Management Plan identification of the used out county pits more for staging and processing as opposed to disposal for this material, although if volume is sufficient some disposal will have to take place on site Add chapter in the Solid Waste Management Plan identifying all of the County pits under County ownership as potential receiving areas for storm debris [County-wide]. There has to be a place, as a result of a storm, for putting downed trees and stumps – whether or not that material would be accepted for permanent disposal or not would be another question entirely.
2. Important not to preclude closed sites to public or private for yard waste composting in reaction to burn bans soon to come. However, uncomfortable tying it directly to reclamation,
 

i.e. total restoration of a pit would not allow room for processing. Under a solid waste permit, bringing in yard waste and processing it is a commercial operation, not reclamation. Chipping versus composting prompts health concerns. Of immediate concern is just strictly yard waste [brush clippings]

## **REVIEW- SUMMARY-CONSENSUS**

### **PROPOSAL:**

1. To make clear Map E represents the County's designated sites and accurately includes all existing operations that should be designated and all of the candidate properties that property owners have for which information is available to verify designation.
2. To make sure Mineral Lands receive the same protection opportunity as Ag and Forestry.
  1. Map E made into the Zoning Atlas large scale maps and added.
  2. Make clear the process for expansion or amendment of Map E can occur through permitting of a CUP or by an individual property owner's request.

### **Summary and Consensus:**

- A number of suggestions made regarding findings and ensuring policy does not preclude uses discussed.
- Focus for future supply will be from North Whidbey from sites excavated or extracted and hauled to existing operations, most from fairly small parcels of land, 5 and 10 acres.
- Some new properties to add to Map E [all adjacent to existing operations or are operations in permitting right now]
- Yet to be determined is the question of North Whidbey and what should be done. The Board is not interested in down zoning all of North Whidbey simply because there may be some mineral resource under part of it.
- As part of Rural Densities review, look at North Whidbey to determine whether there is something more than can be done to safeguard the resource.
- Map E not conclusive. Send letter to all existing operators asking them to confirm that surface mines are correctly depicted and includes all parcels granted approval for surface mines.
- Given current proposal with comments and suggestions made to refine it, the proposal need not go through the Planning Commission process, it is refinement of existing policy.
- Get a better handle on projected need and supply to the extent the County can, looking at North Whidbey as the supply source.
- Amendments can be done annually – a moving target adjusted on an annual basis.
- Develop a simpler process for permitting extraction as opposed to extraction and processing

Meeting adjourned: 12:25 p.m.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS**

**ISLAND COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

---

Mike Shelton, Chairman

---

Wm. L. McDowell, Member

---

William F. Thorn, Member

**ATTEST:**

---

Margaret Rosenkranz, Clerk of the Board